

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Park et al. (U.S. Patent 6,397,367).

In response to the rejections of independent Claims 1, 7, 8 and 12-20, the Examiner states that Park et al. discloses all of the elements of the claims. Park et al. discloses a device and methods for channel coding and rate matching in a communication system. It is again respectfully submitted that the rate matchers of Park et al. are not the same as the radio frame matchers of the present application. The Park et al. rate matchers do not include a radio frame segmenter; each of the radio frame matchers of the present application has a radio frame segmenter and segments each of data frames that have different transmission time intervals into radio frames. The Examiner recites in the Response to Arguments section on page 8 of the Office Action that segmenting is the same as puncturing or matching. This assumption is incorrect. The Examiner is respectfully directed to the 3GPP Technical Specification for Multiplexing Channel Coding, TS 25.212 version 6.4.0, sections 4.2.6 Radio frame segmentation and 4.2.7 Rate matching, in order to ascertain the clear difference between a segmenting process and a puncturing or matching process. The claims of the present application relate to the claims segmentation per radio frame labeled as 121,..., 12N and consist of segmenting each of the data frames that have different transmission time intervals into radio frames. On the contrary, rate matching only means that bits on a transport channel are repeated or punctured, not segmented.

The foregoing distinctions were respectfully presented to the Examiner during a telephone interview held on June 13, 2005 between the Examiner and Applicants, representative, Michael J. Musella. Based on the foregoing and the telephone interview, at least the finality of the Office Action must be withdrawn.

In view of the above discussion, it is believed that the rejections of Claims 1, 7, 8, and 12-20 should be withdrawn. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-6 and 9-11, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective

independent claims.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-20, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over a horizontal line.

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516